

TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION MINUTES
March 28, 2007

Chair Knox White called the Transportation Commission to order at 7:35 p.m.

1. **ROLL CALL** – Roll was called and the following recorded.

Members Present:

John Knox White

Jeff Knoth

Michael Krueger

Eric Schatmeier

Absent:

Robert McFarland

Robb Ratto

Srikat Subramaniam

Staff Present:

Obaid Khan, Supervising Civil Engineer

Barry Bergman, Program Specialist II

2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Commissioner Schatmeier requested a change in the February minutes. He is quoted as saying that if the shuttle loop were bidirectional that the headways would be cut in half, when it should be doubled. The same error is in the support material for the shuttle item and should be changed.

Commissioner Schatmeier moved approval of the minutes with the requested change. Commissioner Knoth seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously, 4-0.

3. **AGENDA CHANGES**

Chair Knox White suggested that the Alameda Landing TDM item be heard before the shuttle study.

4. **COMMISSION COMMUNICATIONS**

5. **ORAL COMMUNICATIONS**

Claire Yeaden Risley noted that on March 12 and March 13, she had requested in writing the Transportation Commission minutes from Alameda Access and the City Clerk, and she had not yet received a response to either request. She noted that she had previously requested them in person starting in the Spring of 2006. She added that the City Clerk had referred her to Public Works, which was not fruitful. She noted that they should be available to the public, and

requested that the Transportation Commission minutes for the last two years be available to the public.

Chair Knox White noted that the minutes that have been approved are now available on the City's website.

Commissioner Krueger believed that hard copies of the minutes should also be available.

Chair Knox White agreed with the Commissioners that the minutes should be available to the public, and apologized to Ms. Risley for her request not being fulfilled.

Liz Cleves noted that at the City Council meeting of March 6, 2007, Councilmember Doug DeHaan addressed an AC Transit engineer and said, "At this point, Shoreline is strictly for the express, the W to San Francisco. At any point in time did we have bus stop service going down there, and I believe we did, and why would that be the area that you would most likely have a higher likelihood of ridership? Because that's where you placed the W... Knowing that this route is known for high usage and high ridership when you go that route." She noted that AC Transit engineer was unable to answer the question, and turned the question over to an AC Transit transportation planner, who stated, "There used to be a bus that used to go down Shoreline. I believe in 2003, December, due to service cuts, I believe it was sent down Otis Drive to save running time. Currently, the bus schedule is about 50 minutes of running time, and I guess, in our business, the more running time, the more, the higher the cost. Taking it down Grand to Shoreline would add running time to the route."

Ms. Cleves noted that Mr. DeHaan then asked, "What is more important, running time or ridership?" The AC Transit planner replied, "I know there was limited resource for the City of Alameda." Mr. DeHaan interjected, "The reason I ask, and I think anyone in the audience understands, that Shoreline itself is adjacent to the heavier density of residents, and that's why you route the W there. I just can't see that run time becomes more important than ridership, but I'm a taxpayer, and I would like to preferably have the 63 bus line on Shoreline." The AC Transit planner responded, "We could cut a different part of the route, and reroute it via Shoreline, if that would be something that the City would want to do." She noted that in the past, she understood that the City must do what AC Transit wants, but noted that AC Transit had made it very clear that they would do what the City wants. She noted that as a taxpayer, she would prefer that the 63 line be back on Shoreline, where there was greater density and no schools. She believed that route would be more profitable for AC Transit, and safer for the children, the crossing guards and other pedestrians in Alameda. She noted that Councilmember DeHaan's question about the relative importance of running time versus ridership was very important, and further asked whether running time or the safety and peace of mind of Alameda taxpayers was more important.

Diane Voss noted that she had also attended the March 6, 2007, City Council meeting, and concurred with Ms. Cleves' statements. She noted that the issue of AC Transit Line 63 on Otis Drive has been a source of disagreement since 2003, taking considerable time of Public Works, City Council, the Transportation Commission and the Transportation Technical Team. She believed it had pitted neighbor against neighbor, angered many parents of Lum School students, caused problems for the crossing guards, been a taxpayer burden, and harassed many residents

that live on Otis Drive. She noted that Councilmember DeHaan's suggestion for putting the 63 back on Shoreline was correct, where the residents of apartments and condominiums could use it. She added that the Hall of Justice was also on the route, which would serve those who have lost their drivers licenses.

6A. SHUTTLE SERVICES AND OPERATIONS ANALYSIS – FINAL PRESENTATION.

Staff Bergman presented the staff report, and detailed the background of this item, including comments made at the last meeting. The consultant has tried to address those concerns in the report, and requested feedback. One point was that the incremental costs of increasing AC Transit service was in the context of Alameda Landing, and the cost of serving the new site may not be comparable to the introduction of a new route. Staff conducted discussions with AC Transit to analyze potential modifications of their existing routes to serve that site. AC Transit indicated that in terms of Alameda Landing, that there is enough time available in the existing Line 19 schedule to reroute it through the site at no additional cost. The 63 could be routed through the Alameda Landing site, although that would require an additional bus. He described and demonstrated the proposed changes.

John Atkinson noted that he was in continual discussion with AC Transit, and received an email from one of their planners regarding the 63 and the 19 lines. He noted that the end goal was to have the public transit provider of Alameda County be the primary transit provider at Alameda Landing. He noted that it may be a two-pronged approach, where shuttles come in the initial phases, since such as service could be implemented quickly, and they may not meet the minimum ridership thresholds AC Transit would need. He noted that they could get ridership built up, and then look at AC Transit as a solution for the long-term.

Public Comment.

There were no speakers.

Close public comment.

Chair Knox White complimented staff on its report, and noted that it answered most of their concerns. He noted that they could add the 19 line at no additional cost, and while it was not a short-term cost, it would not answer the short-term run.

Staff Bergman described the cost factors.

Chair Knox White noted that he would feel comfortable forwarding this to City Council, but wanted to clarify any issues with respect to costs that were not reflective of what was proposed according to the staff report.

Commissioner Krueger noted that he was studying the costs on page 14, and requested further clarification on the map. He noted that the costs did not work out, and that there seemed to be a

discrepancy between the calculation above which talked about 16 hours for two buses, but the mileage was the same at 120.

Mr. Atkinson replied that was with respect to route miles, and that it may not have been changed in the report when the language regarding two buses was added.

Commissioner Krueger wanted to make sure that the report contained apples-to-apples comparisons.

Mr. Atkinson responded that he would fine-tune the numbers.

Commissioner Schatmeier moved to approve the Shuttle Services and Operations Analysis, to include the adjustment of the AC Transit operational cost analysis to conform with the AC Transit proposed routing of one bus; to include *Commissioner Krueger's* comment regarding the map on page 14. *Commissioner Krueger* seconded. Motion passed unanimously, 4-0.

6B. ALAMEDA LANDING TDM GOALS AND PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT – FINAL PRESENTATION.

Staff Bergman presented the staff report and noted that Catellus has revised the plan submitted previously based on the Commission's comments. Staff's additional comments were that the program relied exclusively on surveys, and recommended that some traffic counts be performed to bolster the survey data. Second, the trip reduction for the commercial retail portion was discussed only in terms of employees, and that trips associated with retail customers that contribute to congestion should be included. Staff agreed that the ITE trip generation rates should be used at the baseline to measure the reduction, but that some traffic counts should be conducted to help verify that those rates are valid for this particular site. The draft report indicates that the shuttle be provided at 30-minute headways, and staff would like to see a proposed route, with the possibility of providing more frequent service. Assuming that transit service is provided by AC Transit for the site, the TMA should consider reallocating all shuttle related expenses toward other TDM-related program elements, such as an Eco-Pass or other programs. There was also the discussion of the difficulty of ensuring the high resident response, and staff suggested that participation might be encouraged and enhanced by offering incentives such as completing the survey to receive the Eco-Pass. The cost of the AC Transit service was also discussed, given the available time in the route, which made the cost more competitive with a shuttle. AC Transit discussed examining the 19 line, as well as peak hour service-only on the 63.

Staff Bergman noted that the TDM discussed what would be provided on "Day One", and staff had inquired how the number of bike racks based on demand would work. Staff also inquired about the phasing beyond day one. Staff suggested that the shuttle not be limited to Alameda Landing, and that the West End and Northern Waterfront be considered as well. Under Section 4.2 (Monitoring), the program endeavored to reach a 40% response rate, which was considered to be statistically significant, and inquired what confidence level that referred to. Under Section 4.3, staff requested clarification on the number of trips reduced.

Bruce Knopf, Catellus Development Group, noted that they were pleased with the latest draft, which they believed was cleaner and simpler. He thanked staff for their comments, and noted that trip counts was one of the mitigations that they were obligated to address in the most effective way. They intended to operate a shuttle as successful as the Emeryville Shuttle, and would service shopper needs as well. With respect to reducing trips under the project approvals, he noted that the budget could potentially be increased by 15% if specified conditions are met. He noted that ITE trip rates would be the basis for trip reduction estimates, and noted that it was important to use the surveys to understand the actual trip reductions so they would be consistent. He noted that Bay Area Air Quality Management District and MTC use surveys in order to evaluate success and ridership, and he believed that was appropriate to use the same measure. Regarding the Route 19 proposal, he wondered how long it took for a rider to actually get to BART; they continued to discuss this matter with AC Transit. They expect Eco-Pass to become a program component over the next few months, and for AC Transit to be a provider that serves the site; he noted that there was a lot of work to be done over the next few months.

Public comment.

There were no speakers.

Close public comment.

Commissioner Krueger inquired whether the Eco-Pass would be available for residents of Alameda Point through homeowners dues.

Mr. Knopf noted that AC Transit had been candid in stating the Alameda Landing posed challenges to them with respect to the Eco-Pass, and that they hoped to enact it for residents. He noted that a residential EcoPass program had never been implemented by AC Transit.

Commissioner Krueger noted that they were trying to make it more consistent with a citywide approach, although they were not asking Alameda Landing to support the rest of the City.

Commissioner Krueger noted that staff's comments on page 2 referred to relocating shuttle resources if AC Transit picked up the slack, and inquired whether that was an either/or situation. He envisioned that they may be in a situation where AC Transit provides some baseline level of service, the TDM program provides some additional funding that would allow them to put some additional service hours out there in lieu of a privately operated shuttle.

Staff Khan noted that the Transportation Commission had previously discussed not compensating AC Transit for providing baseline service.

Mr. Knopf noted that during his meetings with AC Transit, he gleaned that the Eco-Pass was their way of providing a convenience and a benefit to a rider, but it did not necessarily result in enhanced levels of service.

Commissioner Krueger noted that on page 9, in the budget section, there was a discussion of the water shuttle. He recalled discussing whether the water shuttle should be funded as an amenity, rather than as a TDM item.

Mr. Knopf responded that the water shuttle was mandated by the DDA between the City and the developer as part of the TDM program.

Commissioner Krueger referenced page 10, Section 4.1 (Annual Report), and added that on page 15, the only parking management options listed were division of specially assigned, optimally located spaces reserved for carpools and ride share vehicles. He was concerned that that was a short list considering the language on page 10 seemed to rule out anything not explicitly mentioned.

Commissioner Schatmeier stated that he would not vote for anything that prohibited City Council from doing anything, unless it was specifically stated in the DDA.

Mr. Knopf noted the language was so boldly worded was to have clarity, and added that if it is approved by the Planning Board, it could still be overruled by the City Council. He described the procedures going forward if that were to occur. He was inclined to remove the optional section at the end, which he did not believe accomplished anything. He noted that the development agreement for the Alameda Landing project specifically stated that there would not be any financial penalties to property owners, tenants or the operation of the program for failure to meet any numerical thresholds or criteria, except for the 15% as specifically stated. He understood the Commissioners' reaction to the language, and noted that it was important for the language to be clear. He suggested that the Transportation Commission approach City Council about additional language in the TDM.

Margo Bradish, Counsel for ProLogis on the project, noted that the development agreement contained very specific language that was approved by City Council, which provided funding for monitoring equipment that was recommended by Public Works staff. The DDA also contained specific language regarding the Year 5 15% adjustment. She noted that the language in the development agreement was very clear in saying that other than the 15% adjustment, there are no consequences to the project, financially or otherwise, if it does not meet any goals. She noted that was intended to give certainty to the developer with respect to their financial obligations. She noted that the cashout can be encouraged, but not mandated.

Commissioner Krueger noted that his specific concern was with respect to the cashout. He did not have any problems with the statement made by Ms. Bradish. However, he noted that if the money was used to provide the money for the parking cashout, that seemed like a TDM measure.

Chair Knox White suggested removing the language, and did not believe it needed to be in the policy. He added that the policy would not override the plan.

Commissioner Krueger agreed with staff with respect to page 3 regarding the bike racks. He suggested clarifying that language that there would be enough to meet demand.

Mr. Knopf noted that their intent was to have enough bike racks to meet demand. He noted that their intent was to serve their obligations to Bike Alameda as much as possible, including the water shuttle.

Chair Knox White noted that with respect to page 8, he was concerned that about the TMA should state that at the end of the day, the Alameda City Council would have ultimate say; the TMA was a mitigation plan rather than an amenity plan for the site. He wanted to clarify where the TMA fit into the larger picture.

Mr. Knopf noted that they could not make any financial changes over a certain dollar threshold without Council approval.

Chair Knox White requested clarity with respect to the possibility of the TDM not working. He believed there should be provisions for the possibility of City Council being able to say that changes should be made as part of the working budget.

Staff Khan suggested that could occur in the annual report that goes to City Council.

Chair Knox White would like the TMA to be directly answerable to the City Council, for definitive accountability.

Mr. Knopf noted that presentation of an annual report to City Council had been negotiated with Council. Their intent was to run the best possible TDM program, ground shuttle and water shuttle, as they do in Mission Bay and Emeryville.

Chair Knox White asked for an explanation of the difference between the provisions regarding the success of the project and the internal rate of return (IRR).

Ms. Bradish noted that (iii) was the result of comments from a particular Councilmember stating that if a lot of money is made on the project, the City wants some of it back. The IRR was a rate of return on the land. The 18% is a benchmark for City participation in land profits. The other two criteria came out of concerns expressed by other Councilmembers that if the project was building out very quickly, and therefore there were more cars on the road than anticipated, there was a need to do more TDM; (ii) and (iii) came out of that discussion.

A discussion of funding details ensued.

Chair Knox White was believed that the trip counts would not ever happen. He did not want to recommend to City Council how they would be paid for, and he would like to remove that sentence so City Council made that decision.

Staff Khan agreed with *Chair Knox White's* comments, and that the referenced sentence on page 12 should come out.

Chair Knox White suggested the following language: "City Council has the option to request the collection of peak hour traffic count data to validate the survey."

Chair Knox White supported private shuttles, but believed that the language on page 14 reading “shuttle service to transit providers” clearly said that the overall plan is not to prioritize AC Transit. He noted that occurred on page 8 referred to a “BART commuter shuttle”, which is more of a point-to-point service rather than one which would pick up additional passengers along the way. He suggested inserting the language “implement and administer any shuttle services” rather than “BART commuter shuttle”, and that it should state that the service should connect to the existing public transit systems.

Chair Knox White noted that part of his thinking in making his comments is that this document will be used as a template for Alameda Point and the Northern Waterfront, and that it was important to release as accurate and solid a document as possible in order to best protect the City’s interests.

Mr. Knopf suggested using “intermodal shuttle” instead of BART commuter shuttle. *Chair Knox White* and *Commissioner Krueger* supported this language.

Commissioner Knoth moved to accept the Alameda Landing TDM Goals and Program Development with the following changes:

Adding residences or HOAs to the Eco-Pass language (in two places);
The TMA should fit into the Citywide strategy of the TDM policies on pages 3 and 8;
Page 10: remove the last half of the sentence referring to the City Council
Page 3: Rephrase (iii) to reflect that there will be sufficient bike racks;
Clarifying in 4.3 that the target numbers for Year 5 will use the same statistical methods so as to correlate with the ITE methodology of the EIR;
On the same page, remove “at City cost to require Public Works staff” and replace it with “to request the collection of actual peak hour”; and
Under the section about the annual report (p. 8), add: “Present to the City of Alameda Transportation Commission and send with Commission recommendations to the Alameda City Council for approval.”

Commissioner Krueger seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously, 4-0.

Chair Knox White believed this kind of document should be part of any development before it is approved. He noted that this was the first time the City had undertaken something like this, and this could be a learning opportunity. He suggested perhaps communicating the Commission’s recommendations regarding future agreement to the Council.

Staff Khan noted that when the TSM/TDM plan is in place, that should address some of the Commission’s concerns. He noted that it would be helpful for developers to have an understanding up front of what would be expected of them.

Staff Bergman responded that he could draft something based on the discussion at tonight’s meeting and prepare it in a form for *Chair Knox White* to sign.

Chair Knox White suggested that a letter to Council be drafted stating the following: 1) staff did a great job in a short amount of time to prepare comments and recommendations relating to the TDM plan, and 2) the TC would like to suggest that in future development that TDM goals and funding amounts be part of early negotiations to facilitate a smooth approval process.

7A. DRAFT TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT FOR GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT

Staff Khan summarized the staff report, and detailed the background and scope of this item. Staff recommended approval of this item.

Chair Knox White believed the draft Transportation Element generally looked good, and inquired why the document needs to go back to all the Boards and Commissions. *Staff Khan* replied that while the Multimodal Circulation Plan policies have been to the other boards and commissions, the pedestrian policies, street functional classification system, and TSM/TDM policies have not yet been circulated.

Commissioner Schatmeier noted that there was a segment in the City that was opposed to bus service. However, he stated that the General Plan should state that transit was an asset to the community, rather than a perceived liability. He believed there should be more bus service, not less.

Chair Knox White suggested adding a new policy, 4.3.1.c, with the following language: “Actively encourage increases in public transit, including frequency and geographic coverage.”

Chair Knox White also suggested including support for a biking or walking estuary crossing. He also recommended that serious study be given to adding transit to bike and pedestrian bridges; since they are required to support maximum loads, there would not be a great increase in cost.

Commissioner Krueger stated that the policy should note that this should not be an automobile crossing, but would accommodate transit, walking and bicycling only.

Chair Knox White also asked that language be inserted to indicate support for the Cross Alameda Trail and for implementation for enhanced transit service, including but not limited to bus rapid transit and an exclusive transit right-of-way.

Commissioner Krueger stated that unless specified in an existing plan, the route for the transit service shouldn't be specified, as this might preclude looking at alternatives, although there should be language referencing the use of the bridge. He believed that Lincoln may have been referenced in the transit plan as a potential route for future rail service, and asked that staff check this.

Commissioner Schatmeier suggested citing support for the Cross Alameda Trail, and support for implementation, as well as enhanced transit service without exclusive right of way, including but not limited to bus rapid transit and right of way rail.

Commissioner Krueger suggested mentioning the Lincoln Avenue corridor on page 35, with respect to the transit plan, as an alternate route.

Commissioner Krueger suggested leaving the bridge in the document, but not to set the route in stone in the General Plan.

Chair Knox White requested that staff work with *Commissioner Krueger* to fine tune the wording.

Chair Knox White noted that in the TSM/TDM, B-3.3 should be changed to read: "Support the use of alternative fuel vehicles *for all* ~~or alternative~~ transportation modes."

Chair Knox White supported Objective D-8, and noted that D-8.1 reads, "Explore funding possibilities to provide new revenues to AUSD to implement a school bus program for elementary and middle school students." He noted that they could look into it, but was unsure how much demand there was for an elementary school bus, which had previously been cut for lack of ridership. He noted that with the neighborhood school system, not many people live that far away from their schools. He noted that a middle school bus program may be more open to examination.

Commissioner Knoth opposed referring to modifications in the curriculum, and requested that the language be modified.

A discussion about bicycle and transportation use classes in schools ensued.

Staff Khan summarized the suggested revision: "Work with the AUSD to include transportation choice awareness in education in the schools."

Regarding support for school buses, *Chair Knox White* believed that "provide new revenues" sounded as if the City might be providing monies to the school district to fund buses.

Commissioner Knoth stated that the issue of providing school buses has not been raised as a concern.

It was agreed to remove the recommended policy D-8.1, regarding the City working with AUSD to pursue funding for school buses.

Commissioner Schatmeier noted that he was totally opposed to casual carpooling in any form. He used to live in Oakland near the biggest casual carpooling stop, and that most carpoolers were taken off high-occupancy vehicles such as buses to low-occupancy vehicles (cars) at a tremendous economic impact, costing AC Transit and BART over \$1 million annually.

<p><i>Commissioner Schatmeier</i> moved to approve the draft Transportation Element, incorporating the comments provided. <i>Commissioner Knoth</i> seconded the motion, which passed unanimously, 4-0.</p>

The meeting adjourned at 10:35 p.m.

G:\pubworks\LT\TRANSPORTATION\COMMITTEES\TC\2007\052307\032807minutes-final.doc